

Serial No. 09/897,611
Reply to Office Action dated November 1, 2004

Docket No.: CIT/K-149

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawings includes changes to Figs. 4A-6B and 8A and 8B. These sheets, which include Figs. 4A-6B and 8A and 8B replace the original sheets including Figs. 4A-6B and 8A-8B.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16 and 24-28 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 27 and 27 have been amended. In addition, Figs. 4A-6B and Figs. 8A and 8B have been amended to address the Office Action's objections. Replacement sheets that include corrected Figs. 4A-6B and Figs. 8A and 8B are attached. Further, the specification has been amended for clarity. The amendments to the specification and drawings are made to conform the specification to the drawings and vice versa. Support for the amendments can also be found in the originally filed claims. Further, the amendments to the specification are essentially a rephrasing of several passages for the purpose of improving their clarity, while maintaining their meaning intact. Accordingly, no new matter is added (see MPEP § 2163.07). Reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

Unless otherwise indicated in the Remarks set forth below, the amendments to the claims are made for the purpose of correcting informalities and/or to more clearly define the claimed invention, and are not made for the purpose of overcoming the cited art.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Rene A. Vazquez, during the March 31, 2005 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the Remarks set forth below.

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), because the drawings allegedly do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Figs.

4A-6B and Figs. 8A and 8B have been amended to address the Office Action's objection. Replacement sheets that include corrected Figs. 4A-6B and Figs. 8A and 8B are attached.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16 and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that it is not clear what the Applicants means by "the two block sets, pixel on or off sequentially or invert the display data, a column block, a row block, a pixel block consisting of $N1 \times M1$."

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the specification and drawings clarify the meaning of these phrases. For example, see the discussion in the specification relating to Figs. 4A and 4B, which explain that the screen save mode is sequentially applied to each of the column blocks 100a-100d, and the corresponding columns within the currently chosen column block (100a in Fig. 4A and 100d in Fig. 4B) are turned on while columns corresponding to other column blocks (100b and 100c) are turned off, except for pixels that are displaying display data.

In Fig. 4A, the pixels in column block 100a, which is the pixel block that the screen save mode is currently being applied to, are turned on, while the pixels in pixel block 100b, for which screen save mode data is not being applied, are turned off except for the pixels that are displaying display data. Similarly, in Fig. 4B, the screen save mode is being applied to

the last pixel block 100d, and thus all pixels in this pixel block are turned on, while the pixels in pixel block 100c are turned off except for pixels that are displaying display data.

Similar clarifications have been made to Figs. 5A-6B and Figs. 8A and 8B, as well as corresponding discussions in the specification.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **René A. Vázquez, Esq.**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/897,611
Reply to Office Action dated November 1, 2004

Docket No.: CIT/K-149

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is the hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "René A. Vázquez", is written over the printed name.

René A. Vázquez, Esq.
Registration No. 38,647

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/RAV:knv
Date: MARCH 31, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610